

GCSE

Edexcel GCSE

German (1231)

This Examiners' Report relates to Mark
Scheme Publication code: UG017963

Summer 2006

Examiners' Report

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information please call our Customer Services on 0870 240 9800, or visit our website at www.edexcel.org.uk.

Summer 2006

Publications Code UG017963

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2006

Contents

Paper 1F Examiners' Report	1
Paper 1H Examiners' Report	3
Paper 2F/H Examiners' Report	7
Paper 3F Examiners' Report	11
Paper 3H Examiners' Report	15
Paper 4F/H Examiners' Report	19
Paper 4C Moderators' Report	23
Statistics	27

Paper 1F - Listening and Responding

Examiners were pleased to see that centres had entered the vast majority of candidates at the appropriate level this year. Candidates had been well prepared for the paper and understood the demands of the various question types. The Foundation paper was tackled quite well by most candidates and differentiated well between candidates of varying abilities. Weaker candidates were able to identify key words and messages from topics with which they were familiar. At the higher end of the scale candidates were able to demonstrate more advanced listening skills such as identifying opinions.

It is important that candidates should be properly prepared to listen for more than key words. They need to develop the skill of listening for the gist and to understand sentence structure to help them improve their listening skills. It is also important that candidates be properly rehearsed in the best way to use the five minute preparation time before the playing of the tape. Candidates should be encouraged to attempt all questions; the importance of having a go cannot be over-stressed. Centres are reminded that copies of past papers are available and that these are an invaluable resource in preparing candidates for the examination. This year's paper differentiated well, producing performances on a par with past years.

Questions 1 -5 (Sport)

Candidates coped well with this accessible topic, many scoring full marks. Questions 1-4 were answered correctly by almost all candidates. *Ich gehe angeln* was not quite so well known.

Questions 6 - 10 (Haustiere)

Most candidates coped well with this question, although it was not done quite as well as the previous one. Surprisingly some candidates did not know *Kaninchen* or *Meerschweinchen*.

Questions 11 - 15 (Die Region)

Most candidates scored well on this question although *Strand* and *Berge* caused problems for many.

Question 16 (Im Reisebüro)

This crossover question often caused problems at this level, the majority of candidates failing to score more than 2 marks. Note-taking is a useful skill which needs practice even at Foundation Level. Most candidates were able to identify *Juni* and *Woche* although a minority of candidates heard *Juli*. Some candidates clearly did not understand the meaning of *wie viele*. Of those who did a number gave *zwei* as their answer, assuming that *Eltern* must be one person. Although many variants of *fliegen* were accepted there were quite a few wild guesses such as *Auto*. Various spellings of *Pension* were accepted. Some candidates suggested *Hotel*, ignoring the importance of *Nein*. (*Möchten Sie in einem Hotel wohnen? ... Nein.*)

Question 17 (In der Stadt)

This crossover question proved relatively accessible to many better Foundation Tier candidates. At C Grade candidates must be able to extract details and points of view from language spoken at normal speed. Candidates proved adept at identifying the appropriate shops for the purchases mentioned.

Question 18 (Schule)

This crossover question produced some good performances from better candidates. The first answer was correctly identified by most candidates. The majority were also able to link *wiederholen* with *ein zweites Mal machen*. Somewhat surprisingly many candidates failed to see the links between *Beruf* and *Job* and also between *Englisch/Französisch* and *Fremdsprachen*.

Question 19 (Stars)

This question proved a good discriminator at crossover level. The most accessible sections proved to be the link between *Zeitung* and *Journalist* and also between *Söhnen/Tochter* and *Familie*. Somewhat surprisingly many candidates overlooked the connection between *Filmstar* and *Film*.

Questions 20 - 24 (Ein neuer Job)

This question was targeted at Grade F and therefore proved very accessible for most candidates. The only problem identified was the time in Q22 where a sizable minority of candidates could not cope with *halb acht*, assuming it to mean *8.30*. This particular time has been tested frequently over the past few years and therefore candidates ought to be familiar with it.

Question 25 (Illness)

As usual this question proved quite taxing for the majority of candidates although most gained some marks for the first two parts of the question. Most knew *Samstag* and were able to gain something on the symptoms although there were frequent wild guesses. Few candidates knew *morgen* and the numbers in the time caused great difficulties for all but the very best Foundation Tier candidates.

Question 26

Candidates must ensure that they read the English questions carefully and that their English answers are unambiguous. A number of candidates said when or how often Dieter eats his favourite food. Few candidates knew *Erdbeeren* and some of these lost the mark by assuming that it was *strawberry icecream* rather than the fruit itself. Centres are reminded that any word in the minimum core vocabulary may feature in future examinations and therefore candidates need to be familiar with the full range. There was a strong tendency to extrapolate from information an expected answer rather than to listen closely e.g. cutting out meat was often rendered as a healthier diet. The last part of the question proved the most accessible although a sizable minority assumed that *Preisen* meant prizes or even pies!

Paper 1H - Listening and Responding

This paper enabled most candidates to demonstrate their skill whilst at the same time discriminating effectively between candidates of differing abilities. The best candidates displayed a high level of comprehension and listening skills, together with an ability to express themselves accurately. Although the majority of candidates had been correctly entered for this paper there was a sizable minority who would have scored more highly overall if they had taken the Foundation Tier paper. The vast majority of candidates had been well prepared for this paper and clearly understood the demands of the different question types. Copies of past papers are available and are an invaluable resource when preparing for the examination.

At this level candidates must be given the opportunity for adequate practice in developing more global listening techniques. Some weaker candidates were unable to go beyond listening for key words. This paper requires from candidates an ability to show understanding in a variety of topic areas. The strongest candidates were able to recognise attitudes, opinions and emotions drawn from a variety of sources and referring to past, present and future events and to give precise answers in the demanding final section. Crossover questions were tackled more confidently at this level.

Unfortunately there are still a large number of illegible answers. This, compounded with a poor standard of German spelling, made it difficult on occasions to assess answers written in German. Candidates would be well advised to use black ink for their answers. Lighter shades of blue can often be difficult to read and thus jeopardise candidates' chances to some extent.

Question 1 (Im Reisebüro)

This crossover question was generally well answered at the higher level, despite inaccuracies in spelling.

Question 2 (Schule)

This crossover question was much better done at Higher Level although weaker candidates still had some difficulties linking the synonyms on the tape and the paper. The link between *Rechnen* and *Mathe* caused the most difficulties.

Question 3 (Kurznachrichten)

This question, targeted at Grade A, discriminated very well between the best candidates and the rest. Many found it difficult to allocate the news report to the appropriate category. The links between targeted vocabulary were in most cases relatively simple for this level e.g. *Auto* with *Wagen*, *gestohlen* with *Dieb*, *Gesundheit* with *Stress/Herzproblem* although there was a lot of material to sift through to find the crucial information. Most candidates who scored on this question were able to link *Euro/Dollar* with *Finanz*.

Question 4 (Berufspläne)

This question produced a wide range of marks. The most correctly answered question was part a) *studieren*. Where full marks were achieved the candidate was aware of what he/she was looking for and had sometimes sorted out the correct part of speech, perhaps during the 5 minutes reading time. Very few spotted the link between *im Freien* and *draußen*, although this has been used in previous papers. Also problematic was the link between *nicht viel* and *wenig*. Many candidates went for *nicht* or *viel* as answers because they had heard these very words on the tape. Candidates must realise that their suggested answer must make sense in the context.

Question 5 (Ferien)

Stronger candidates made a fair attempt at this section, but weaker candidates achieved very little. The Spanish side of the grid was done less well than the German side. There were quite a lot of correct attempts at *entspannen*. Weaker candidates recognised *Strand* in answers such as *guter Strand*. *Entspannen* was often mistaken for *in Spanien*. Only the very best were able to pick out *ruhige Ferienhäuser*. On the German side of the answer grid some decided they had to put disadvantages. A number of candidates did not appreciate the significance of *leider* and thus quoted *6 Stunden* as a possible answer. *Landschaft* was generally well recognised but spellings of *faszinierend* were often not close enough to be acceptable. Clever candidates included an alternative adjective that they were able to spell. *Wandern* was generally recognised although *frische Luft* caused a surprising number of problems. A number of candidates ignored this year's tape and supplied answers to similar questions on past papers.

Question 6 (Zu Hause)

Many better candidates were able to score almost full marks on this question. The vocabulary links between the tape and the questions were for the most part relatively straightforward e.g. *vormittags* - *mittags*, *saubermachen* - *putzen*, *glücklich* - *zufrieden*. In the final part of the question many candidates went for the two distractors, failing to understand the crucial importance of *sonst*.

Question 7 (In der Stadt)

This crossover question was answered very well at this level.

Question 8 (Stars)

Although this was a crossover question it was not without challenges for the more able candidate. The first two parts were very successfully answered at this level. However only a minority managed to link *Zukunftspläne* to *nächstes Jahr*. Equally unknown was *kaum*, of crucial importance in *ich schwimme kaum mehr*.

Question 9 (Healthy Eating)

The final two questions were, of course, the most demanding on the paper, being targeted at the A* grade. The importance of including all necessary details in clear English cannot be overemphasised. Candidates should understand that a one word answer is rarely sufficient at this level. Many candidates lost marks because they included only some of the necessary information or could not phrase their answers sufficiently clearly.

Candidates fared slightly better on this question than Q10 although the question differentiated well, only the very best scoring highly. Few candidates appreciated the importance of a variety of fruit and vegetables, lots of fruit and vegetables (emphasising quantity) being the most frequent answer. Many identified fast food as being undesirable although *total* was missed by many who suggested eating less burgers and other fast food. Only the strongest candidates produced variations on reduced life expectancy, many weaker ones merely quoted health warnings that smoking kills. 30 produced the usual problems associated with numbers and many forgot to include *per day*. The candidate who put *3 minutes exercise per week* is a victim of wishful thinking!

Question 10 (Motherhood)

This question differentiated well between the very best, for whom it was intended, and the rest. There were a lot of misconceptions in the first question as a result of *das Schlimmste* e.g. she got slim. There was also a lot of misunderstanding of *aufstehen*, with staying up being the most popular. Many candidates came up with acceptable versions of not raising a child in the city although many assumed that they moved because they needed more room. The majority identified her son as being the most important although only a minority identified time for herself or suitable variations as the other correct answer. Only the very best understood that she was glad that she chose motherhood. Some identified giving up freedom, many understanding the complete reverse i.e. that she now had more freedom. Again only the very best understood the full concept of the baby's smile causing all problems to be forgotten; many thought that the baby caused or would cause problems and presumed crying rather than smiling.

Papers 2F and 2H - Speaking

This year's role plays were all comparable in terms of demand and difficulty with those of previous sessions and were accessible to candidates at their appropriate levels.

The overall standard of German attained by candidates remains commendable and yet again reflects positively on the commitment and input of colleagues in all the centres. Well prepared candidates at both levels achieved praiseworthy results, particularly if the Teacher Examiner showed patience. There is, however, a distinction to be made between being well prepared and relying too heavily on "pre-learned" material. Here, the candidate does not react flexibly enough to the questions and question sequences posed by the Teacher Examiners and the conversations lose spontaneity. In some cases this results in a disconnected interchange in which candidates fail to achieve their potential.

Good practice noted was when the length of the two conversations was equal and covered a range of areas within the topics, enabling students to respond spontaneously and authentically within the context. The questions in the Teacher Examiner Handbook are for guidance only and not intended to be worked through as a prescribed list.

Timing of the oral test overall continues to pose problems in a small, but significant number of cases. This can adversely affect the candidate. The timing of the Conversation for the Higher tier is to last 6 - 7 minutes and that for the Foundation 4 - 5 minutes. Overall, the test including role plays, will last longer.

A Role Plays

1. As expected, *Karotten* and *Kartoffeln* were the most popular choices. The remainder of the role play was mostly well communicated.
2. Again, this was accessible and posed few problems.
3. *Pommes* with interesting variations, often *Frites/Fritten/Pommes Frites*, was the popular choice of food. Drinks were well known.
4. *T-Shirt* and *Glas* were the most commonly chosen items. There was a pronunciation problem with *Kasse*.
5. Colours and cost were well done. There were interesting variations on *Schal (Scharf)*, with *Hut* being the most popular item despite anglicised pronunciations at times.
6. *Käse* in varying forms of mispronunciation and *Wurst/Fleisch* were the preferred choices, otherwise few problems.

B Role Plays

These role plays differentiated well between the Foundation and Higher Levels, representing an entry point for the Higher and plateau for the Foundation candidates. It is important to be familiar with the format before conducting the test. Fewer Teacher Examiners, but still a significant minority, rephrased unpredictable questions in this session if the candidate appeared not to have understood the question. When this happens the candidate's response is rejected. There were, however, fewer reported cases of the Teacher Examiner accidentally reading out the candidate's suggested utterances if they are first to speak in tasks 2 - 4.

1. Usually well done. Asking the time of the evening meal was the most common problem.
2. Reflexive verb forms were rare, but candidates found ways round this. *Zahnpasta* was the most common item requested. Asking to phone home was mostly well done.
3. This caused few difficulties, with the German pronunciation of *Ticket* being acceptable. Asking the question in task 3 posed a few problems.
4. Most candidates were able to convey the tasks, but asking if it's far still causes problems with *Wie lange ist es?* or *Ist es lange?* occurring frequently.
5. Many candidates failed to mention Düsseldorf, perhaps because it was mentioned in the introduction, but not in the task. There were amusing attempts at reserving a seat - *Sessel* and *Stuhl* conjuring up varying images. Otherwise this role play was well done.
6. *Fach* in this role play was not widely known. Task 4 - asking the friend a question also caused problems in that the 2nd "du" not 3rd person "dein Freund" was required.
7. Confusion about "your friend" (again 2nd or 3rd person) meant this task was not always well done.
8. As in B4, asking how far it is caused confusion. The other tasks were communicated. Swimming pool and museum were the most popular choices. Candidates should take care to avoid the French pronunciation, *Musee*, which cannot be credited.

Advice to centres for the A and B role plays, particularly those new to Edexcel, is to revise thoroughly basic vocabulary on food, drink, clothes, toiletries, ticket buying and shopping, and to focus on asking basic questions - *Möchtest du? Wann/wo ist? Gibt es? Darf ich? Kann man? Wie weit ist es? Haben Sie.....? Hast du.....?*

C Role Plays

This proved to be a good test with a good spread of marks and some excellent performances from candidates were heard. Centres and candidates appear to be familiar with the format and rationale of the C role play, so appropriate expansion within the confines of the scenario was often evident. However, in order to develop their responses fully, rather than give a one-word answer or just short phrase or sentence, it is vital that candidates read the rubric carefully before embarking on the role play in order to understand the relevant context. Marks were frequently lost through careless preparation - i.e. C3 required asking about the possibility of work experience next February: too many candidates were asking for Summer holiday jobs and could not supply "Termine". It was noted that candidates still tend, at times, to have problems asking questions and responding in the past tense. As mentioned in the B role plays, Teacher Examiners must avoid rephrasing the unpredictable questions. It is acceptable to repeat the question, but it should be borne in mind that the candidate's first utterance is what is marked. Examiners acknowledged that occasionally TE's rephrased the question in order to keep the flow of dialogue and the candidate's confidence going, but no credit is awarded in such situations.

- 1 This was mostly well attempted, perhaps also as it could have been a familiar situation for candidates, but in task 5 many candidates supplied their own mobile telephone number! There was opportunity for expansion in describing the lost mobile phone which not all candidates took.
- 2 Here the rubric states booking for a group, not an individual, which candidates did not always make clear. "Sporthotel" was clearly visible, but few candidates made reference to this.
- 3 This was performed creditably on the whole, apart from the above mentioned dates.
- 4 A less frequently heard role play, but commendably attempted with interesting responses for task 5.
- 5 This was generally well executed, but task 3 required ordering drinks for more than one person - again it is important to absorb the rubrics fully. Most candidates made mention of the vegetarian options.
- 6 This was usually reasonably well communicated, but task 5 sometimes caused confusion. Perhaps candidates thought they were already in the airport rather than travel agent.
- 7 Less frequently heard, but no real problems noted. Task 3 - "*Wo und wann*" is now familiar and usually well covered.
- 8 Frequently heard and generally accessible, but provided the full range of marks from full expansion to one-word utterances. This required a degree of flexibility and imagination on the part of the candidate.

Conversations

At both Foundation and Higher Levels the whole range of performances and topic coverage was represented. The overall standard attained is praiseworthy with some outstanding conversations heard at Higher Tier which were a pleasure to listen to. At Foundation Level, too, candidates made every effort to communicate, however limited their command of the language. The support of the Teacher Examiner in the way in which the conversation is conducted is vital as to how the candidate performs. The timing of the conversations is most important - again this rests in the hands of the Teacher Examiner. As clearly stated on pages 8 and 9 of the Handbook, each conversation should be of equal length with the time allocation (4-5 minutes Foundation and 6-7 minutes Higher) being evenly split between the two topics. The conversation is marked globally - i.e. both topics are given equal weight so as to test a candidate's response to both familiar, prepared, questions and those set in a wider context. Overrunning the timing in topic one results in loss of marks. Good practice involves the presentation option for topic one being kept to a minimum, rather as an aid to candidates' confidence at the beginning of the conversation, with the Teacher Examiner soon asking questions and engaging candidates in dialogue, based on what they have prepared. Lengthy presentations were sometimes heard frequently in the form of pre-learnt material. As soon as the Teacher Examiner posed questions, the candidate often floundered, being unable to produce correct past tenses and manipulate the language appropriately. Examiners noted that where centres had encouraged their candidates to shorten, or even dispense with the presentation a feeling of spontaneity was achieved, giving candidates a greater chance of giving an optimum performance, and time limits were rarely exceeded.

The quality of recordings and administrative matters in general continue to improve each year.

Note to Centres

Please note that Awarding Bodies are currently reviewing the purpose and format of feedback given to centres regarding internally assessed units. Edexcel has adopted a standard online feedback form E9 which offers centres improved feedback with results via Edexcel Online. We are no longer able to provide centres with subject-specific feedback on the papers which are not classed as "internally assessed".

Summer 2006 is the last examination for which Edexcel will provide U9L reports on Paper 2 Orals. We will continue, however, to give feedback via the standard E9 reports on the coursework paper 4C.

Paper 3F - Reading and Responding

On the whole centres entered their candidates appropriately at Foundation level. Consequently, examiners felt that they were assessing the performance of genuine Foundation level candidates. A few candidates failed to attempt the more demanding questions and the importance of 'having a go' must be stressed. Centres are reminded that questions appear in a sequence of peaks and troughs to encourage candidates to keep going to the end and that individual questions follow the sequence of the text and thus appear in chronological order.

Examiners were encouraged to note once again that candidates fared well at both tiers and were able to progress purposefully through the papers. The vast majority of candidates had been well prepared for the paper and clearly appreciated the demands of the various question types.

Question 1

This represented a gentle and familiar introduction to the paper for Foundation candidates. Most did well here but a few chose D for (iii).

Question 2

As anticipated, this was generally accessible to most candidates.

Question 3

This was a crossover question targeting Grade D and worked well as a discriminator. More able candidates demonstrated the ability to pick out the key words in the texts and match them with the corresponding word from the same 'family' in the answers. Weaker candidates found this question more challenging. Familiarity with word families is vital in target language testing at this level and Centres would be well advised to train candidates to recognise the significance and usefulness of such word families.

Question 4

This crossover question targeted Grade C and only stronger candidates managed to identify the key concept in each category. The Grade Description at this level does require candidates to identify and extract detail but weaker candidates tended to lift chunks from the text that bore no relation to the headings on the grid. Performance varied depending on how carefully candidates had read the text and whether they were able to link the lexis to the relevant heading.

Wohnort: common incorrect answers here included *Bergisch Gladbad (geboren), 1987*.

Schultyp: common misconceptions included *Französisch, Sport, Talent, Wetzlar, leidenschaftlich gern Französisch*. It is difficult to understand at times how candidates could have arrived at some of these answers.

Fremdsprache: this was generally well done

Hobby: *Gymnasium* was, perhaps predictably, the most common misconception here. Not quite so predictable were *Teilnehmer* or *Französisch*. Candidates did need to appreciate the difference in Fabian's attitude towards classical and Hip-Hop music. This requirement is to be found in the Grade Description at this level.

Training: this was answered well on the whole. Most correct answers focused on *32 Stunden (pro Woche)* rather than *in der Turnhalle*. The most common incorrect answers included *seit 1999*, *Olympischen (Sommerspielen)*, *Teilnehmer* and *aufs Gymnasium*.

Somewhat inexplicably, answers for Fremdsprache and Hobby were frequently given in English even when the other parts of the question had been answered in German.

Question 5

Candidates were very familiar with the lexis here and fared well.

Questions 6

In general, candidates were comfortable with this topic and scored well. Some struggled to remember *Arzt*.

Question 7

This question focused on a favourite topic and targeted Grade D. Performance was variable depending on how adept candidates were at identifying the key lexis within a slightly longer sentence.

Question 8

This was the final crossover question and it represented a challenge to many borderline candidates.

Once again, success here relies on candidates being familiar with common synonyms and paraphrases. Candidates must be able to connect the e.g. *vor sechs Monaten* in the text with the *seit einem halben Jahr* in the answers and Centres with such borderline candidates would be advised to devote some time developing this awareness, this skill in their candidates. Weaker candidates tended to focus on the wrong aspects, thus one of the most frequently incorrect responses chosen was (vi), presumably because candidates recognised the *Theorie* in the text and felt they could link it with the *theoretische* in the answers.

Question 9

A small minority of candidates continue to answer the English questions in German and thus sadly debar themselves from scoring at all. Clearly candidates' use of English should be unambiguous. On the whole, candidates found this text accessible.

Q9(a) This was generally answered correctly but depended on how well candidates knew the days of the week. The spelling of *Thursday* was not always without problems.

Q9(b) Again, this was largely correct. Candidates who did not read the text properly opted for *Monday (5th June)*.

Q9(c) Nearly all candidates got this one right.

Q9(d) This was answered well. Common misconceptions included: *6€, 15 %, 15 Euro*.

Q9(e) This was the most challenging sub-question and required candidates to read the text properly to find the answer. Many candidates simply made a guess based on common assumption and gave e.g. *phone* or *on the internet*. Those candidates who did understand that you would need to go to the circus were often unable to express themselves in coherent English. As usual, examiners were as sympathetic as possible in their assessment of candidates' responses.

Question 10

Q10(a) Relatively few candidates managed to identify both *back* and *stomach*. There was evidence of much guessing, but a very common wrong answer was *leg*. A large number of candidates gave *the problem zones*.

Q10(b) This was well done.

Q10(c) There was a huge variety of incorrect answers to this part. Candidates clearly did not understand *Arzt* and examiners saw responses which included *do art classes, become a teacher/trainer/doctor, and go to art gallery/lessons*.

Q10(d) Most candidates answered this well. Common incorrect answers included *weekdays, 5 days a week, all week except Sunday*.

Q10(e) In general examiners felt this paper was fair and had enabled candidates to demonstrate their true ability. They also felt that the topic areas covered were of interest to a wide spectrum of candidates.

Paper 3H - Reading and Responding

On the whole centres entered their candidates appropriately at Foundation level. Consequently, examiners felt that they were assessing the performance of genuine Foundation level candidates. A few candidates failed to attempt the more demanding questions and the importance of 'having a go' must be stressed. Centres are reminded that questions appear in a sequence of peaks and troughs to encourage candidates to keep going to the end and that individual questions follow the sequence of the text and thus appear in chronological order.

As with the Foundation paper, the overwhelming majority of candidates had been correctly entered for Higher tier. However, there was some evidence that centres had been over optimistic about their candidates' performance in this paper. There were more examples than in previous years of rubric infringement, most notably in Q9 and an increased number of candidates failed to attempt all parts of all questions. Examiners felt that all questions were appropriate in terms of level and discriminated well. The content of the texts was perceived to be well pitched to have interest value to candidates.

Question 1

This was a crossover question targeting Grade D and worked well as a discriminator. More able candidates demonstrated the ability to pick out the key words in the texts and match them with the corresponding word from the same 'family' in the answers. Weaker candidates found this question more challenging. Familiarity with word families is vital in target language testing at this level and Centres would be well advised to train candidates to recognise the significance and usefulness of such word families.

Question 2

This crossover question targeted Grade C and only stronger candidates managed to identify the key concept in each category. The Grade Description at this level does require candidates to identify and extract detail but weaker candidates tended to lift chunks from the text that bore no relation to the headings on the grid. Performance varied depending on how carefully candidates had read the text and whether they were able to link the lexis to the relevant heading.

Wohnort: common incorrect answers here included *Bergisch Gladbad (geboren), 1987*.

Schultyp: common misconceptions included *Französisch, Sport, Talent, Wetzlar, leidenschaftlich gern Französisch*. It is difficult to understand at times how candidates could have arrived at some of these answers.

Fremdsprache: this was generally well done

Hobby: *Gymnasium* was, perhaps predictably, the most common misconception here. Not quite so predictable were *Teilnehmer* or *Französisch*. Candidates did need to appreciate the difference in Fabian's attitude towards classical and Hip-Hop music. This requirement is to be found in the Grade Description at this level.

Training: this was answered well on the whole. Most correct answers focused on *32 Stunden (pro Woche)* rather than *in der Turnhalle*. The most common incorrect answers included *seit 1999, Olympischen (Sommerspielen), Teilnehmer* and *aufs Gymnasium*.

Somewhat inexplicably, answers for Fremdsprache and Hobby were frequently given in English even when the other parts of the question had been answered in German.

Question 3

Performance varied, which was to be expected since this targets a higher grade and as such discriminated well. This question type relies on the use of synonyms and candidates' ability to identify synonymous phrases, and, as stated elsewhere in this report, centres would be well advised to practise and revise synonyms with their more able candidates. No particular pattern for incorrect responses could be discerned.

Question 4

More able candidates coped well with the requirements of this higher grade question. Careful and detailed reading of both the text and the answer headlines is essential, since candidates are required to demonstrate the ability to understand globally.

Question 5

This was another crossover question.

Once again, success here relies on candidates being familiar with common synonyms and paraphrases. Candidates must be able to connect the e.g. *vor sechs Monaten* in the text with the *seit einem halben Jahr* in the answers and Centres with such borderline candidates would be advised to devote some time developing this awareness, this skill in their candidates. Weaker candidates tended to focus on the wrong aspects, thus one of the most frequently incorrect responses chosen was (vi), presumably because candidates recognised the *Theorie* in the text and felt they could link it with the *theoretische* in the answers.

Question 6

This question focused on a favourite topic and targeted Grade D. Performance was variable depending on how adept candidates were at identifying the key lexis within a slightly longer sentence.

Question 7

This question focused on a topic that candidates clearly connected with. Most were willing to have a good attempt at it and only rarely were boxes left blank. Scores of two or three on this question were common and in fact there was a pleasing number of scripts where full marks were achieved, demonstrating good understanding with, at times, highly effective paraphrasing.

It should be noted this question targeted a higher grade and at this level the QCA Grade Description for Reading requires that candidates should extract points of view, opinions and emotions and identify key information in a longer text. The positive and negative aspects will be mixed within such a text and candidates must be able to determine the bias of each point made. Not all candidates were able to pinpoint the positive as opposed to the negative aspects and place the relevant answers in the appropriate boxes. Nevertheless, Examiners were encouraged to note that there has been an improvement year on year in candidates' performance in this test type and this kind of text.

On the whole, the negative responses were completed more successfully than the positive ones. *Nicht billig* was the most common correct response, although sadly, a number of candidates omitted the *nicht* and so completely changed the meaning thus rendering it invalid. (Similarly, *nur 2 Tage geöffnet* sometimes appeared as a positive, without the *nur*). *lange Wartezeiten* was also frequently identified as a disadvantage by the majority. Some candidates offered incomplete answers by picking out random chunks of text e.g. *komplett ins Leere, viel Erfahrung, nicht allzu oft leisten* which did not represent valid answers. Unfortunately, the same as every year, a few gave the example as one of their answers.

Question 8

This question targeted Grade A and discriminated accurately. Examiners were encouraged by candidates' performance here.

Question 9

This question with answers in English targeted A* and sorted out very definitely the better candidates. Weaker candidates often failed to attempt the question at all or wrote irrelevant statements based on a highly superficial insight into the text. In addition examiners saw a worryingly large proportion of scripts where candidates had answered this question in German and debarred themselves from scoring any marks at all.

At this level candidates must be able to pinpoint the exact information required and cannot score marks for approximations or 'nearly theres', although examiners are very tolerant and sympathetic in their approach. A* candidates completed the grid in a coherent, detailed and accurate manner and there was a pleasing number of high scores with a few gaining full marks here. On the other hand weaker candidates responded with a personal evaluation of school life, its rules and regulations and displayed generally negative attitudes towards school. Such candidates found it difficult to give unambiguous answers which went beyond minimalist detail to score the mark. Examiners were thus often presented with vague, unconnected ideas when the questions required precise and connected ones. This demonstrated clearly that candidates had to read the text closely and show in depth understanding in order to score the marks. This question therefore did what it had set out to do.

In all parts, candidates struggled to distinguish between opinion and reason. A fairly significant number had otherwise correct responses in the wrong box. More able candidates had clearly understood the gist of the text but were unable to organise the knowledge in the way that would gain marks. Centres would be advised to focus on developing the appreciation of opinion and reason in their stronger, more able candidates.

	Opinion	Reason
Christoph	<p>The most frequently understood concept was that of bigger schools/smaller classes/better teacher: student ratio. <i>15 in a class</i> was offered as an answer here, which demonstrates broad but only superficial understanding of the text.</p> <p>There were random answers about politics and politicians.</p>	<p>Many students understood the necessity of school for education.</p> <p>With the exception of the more able, few candidates understood potential advantage for quieter students.</p> <p>There were frequent references to heat - presumably from <i>heißt?</i> buildings (<i>Bildung?</i>) playtime (<i>spielen?</i>)</p>

<p>Lars</p>	<p><i>Doof</i> and <i>blöd</i> were generally known by candidates, but the majority were unable to go beyond the notion of school being stupid. Indeed, school was often noted as being bland or - examiners felt inappropriately - <i>crap</i>.</p> <p>Only the stronger candidates really understood about the closure of the smokers' corner. Many thought he was against the provision of smoking facilities in school.</p> <p><i>Dinge</i> was not widely known. It was often written in target language and examiners saw references to dinghy making.</p>	<p>There were many answers about smoking not being allowed or teachers smoking and a small minority of candidates interpreted <i>heimlich</i> as <i>at home</i>.</p> <p>The most commonly correct element was the reference to learning things which are not needed in life. However, whilst many candidates noted that too many subjects were taught, they ignored the relative clause which followed.</p> <p>There was frequent reference to maths costing a lot and hugely long answers detailing the relative pointlessness of maths and working in a shop.</p>
<p>Kerstin</p>	<p>Candidates found this the most challenging part of Q9 and it was a highly effective discriminator. <i>abschaffen</i> was known by only the stronger candidates.</p> <p>There were many references to people being late for school to writing/making/passing notes.</p>	<p>Lots of candidates made an educated guess and mentioned repeating a year for getting poor marks.</p> <p>Many candidates were able to pick out <i>we are not all academic</i> but on its own this was inadequate as an answer.</p> <p><i>ausgelacht</i> was known by only the stronger candidates.</p>

Whilst recognising completely that candidates' knowledge and understanding of German are being assessed here, examiners were slightly concerned at the standard of English in this question. There were instances of candidates being unable to express themselves in clear, precise English. *Less students*, *aloud* and *practicle* are but three of the many examples examiners saw.

Clearly, many answers indicate that candidates are quite simply not reading the texts carefully enough. For those candidates aiming at a higher grade it is imperative that they pay attention to the actual content of the texts and not make assumptions. Candidates should ensure that what they have written is relevant to the question and can be supported by the text.

Candidates should also be encouraged to keep their answers as concise as possible. It is not advisable for candidates to put down everything they have understood as this may lead to their losing the mark if they hedge their bets or negate their answer. The space given for the answer is deemed adequate for a full & complete answer.

Paper 4F/H - Writing

Centres are advised to discuss the level of entry with their candidates. Whilst the overwhelming majority are entered correctly, there are always a few, usually at higher level, who are inappropriately entered and fall of the end of the scale. These few would score better at foundation level.

Paper 4F

Question 1 - SCHOOL

The list of five subjects and five opinions was an accessible start to the paper. Most candidates managed to score 6 or more points. The impressive range of opinions included *fantastisch*, *langweilig*, *doof*, *toll*, *nicht mein Fall* and *zum Gähnen*. Marks were lost usually because of English spelling (biology, geography) or omissions. However, the generally sound spelling at this level suggested that candidates were well-prepared for this topic area.

Question 2 - JOURNEY TO WORK

This question type still causes problems. The first three verbs were often correctly conjugated, but *lesen* and *haben* remained a mystery for most. The icons, prescriptive at this stage, were often misinterpreted: *Krankenhaus* instead of *Haltestelle*; *Geld* instead of *Fahrkarte*; and surprisingly *Zug* instead of *Bus*. The correct spellings of *Kaffee* and *Tee* were often unknown.

Question 3 - MAKING ARRANGEMENTS

Even if the previous question caused problems, many candidates were able to get back on an even keel here and many managed to communicate all four bullet points even if the quality of language was weak. It was clear that the perfect tense had been well drilled with *kaufen*. However, some who were able to produce a sentence such as *Ich habe ein Hemd gekauft*, were unable to write correctly *Ich bin nicht zu Hause*. The verbs *anrufen* or *telefonieren* were occasionally unknown, but there were good attempts to manipulate the stimulus using *sprechen* as an alternative.

Paper 4F Question 4(a) / Paper 4H Question 1(a) - CINEMA

Perhaps because of preparation for the oral exam, this topic area was clearly very familiar. Weaker candidates tended to rely on the stimulus letter, for example, simply changing the opinion to *Ich bin ein Fan von englischen Filmen*, but the more able gave a wide range of opinion such as *Horrorfilme gefallen mir am besten, weil sie sehr gruselig sind*.

Surprisingly some candidates at foundation level who were able to produce a correct perfect tense with *kaufen* in question 3 could not do the same with *gehen* or *sehen* in this question. However, most could write a largely coherent account.

Higher level candidates scored well, but many seem to forget that here they must take the opportunity to produce a good range of structures including subordination, modals and infinitive clauses if they wish to score top marks.

Paper 4F Question 4(b) / Paper 4H Question 1(b) - HOME AND FAMILY

This was the more popular of the two crossover questions. Descriptions of family members were sometimes overlong and repetitive, but there were good attempts to describe relationships with recurrent use of *leiden*, *ausstehen*, *sich verstehen mit*, *auskommen mit*, *lieben* and *hassen* at both levels.

The greatest problem occurred with the third bullet point when many candidates failed to produce a past tense correctly. This often affected the mark for Communication and Content.

Nevertheless, even at foundation level, responses were sound and despite the quality of language, there was enough material communicated for candidates to be scoring 5 or 6 and above for Communication and Content.

The best candidates are able to stay within the word limit and to produce concise and complex responses such as this:

Wir sind fünf in unserer Familie und ich bin die älteste von drei Schwestern. Obwohl wir alle sehr beschäftigt sind, kommen wir gut miteinander aus. Mein Vater ärgert sich manchmal, wenn wir unsere Hausaufgaben nicht machen. Letzte Woche habe ich viel zu Hause geholfen, um ein bisschen Taschengeld zu verdienen. Am Mittwoch habe ich den Tisch gedeckt und auch abgewaschen, obwohl das keinen Spaß gemacht hat. Wenn wir die €500 gewinnen, kaufen wir einen neuen Fernseher.

In 76 words, the candidate responds successfully to all the bullet points in sophisticated and appropriate German with a wide range of syntax and structure.

Paper 4H

Question 2(a) - URLAUB

This was a popular choice of question. Examiners were impressed with candidates' knowledge of Germany and of German food and drink. There were detailed descriptions of the *Dom* and *Schokoladenmuseum* in *Köln*, the *Olympiastadion* and the *Marienplatz* in *München*, the *Reichstag* and the *Brandenburger Tor* in *Berlin*, to give but three examples; generally *Currywurst* and *Sauerkraut* were frowned upon, but *Schnitzel*, *Kuchen*, *Gemüseintopf* and even *Germknödel* were popular. *Das gute deutsche Bier* had often been savoured and enjoyed! References to the World Cup or to meeting a favourite football star in the café made for amusing reading and there were several examples of romantic encounters over an ice-cream.

The quality of language is varied at this level. Most candidates are aware of the need to vary sentence structure and include examples of *weil*, *wenn* or *obwohl* clauses, although the accuracy varies. Modal verbs were more in evidence this year. Few candidates can use infinitive clauses successfully.

Question 2(b) - ARBEITSPRAKTIKUM

Despite the familiar nature of this topic, those who attempted it tended to produce weaker responses. The bullet points are intended to give some indication of how to develop the letter and the best candidates used them as a plan. However, many simply write a rambling series of sentences which are unrelated.

Disastrous experiences ranged from an argument with the boss to dirty toilets or disappointing food. It was acceptable for candidates to give the pros and cons of their own experience or to be more general in their approach.

Again, it is expected that candidates will have been given some structures to use when weighing up the pros and cons. For example, this was an ideal opportunity to use *auf der einen Seite* and *auf der anderen Seite*.

It was felt that in this and the previous question, vocabulary was appropriate and in general better than in previous years. Adverbial phrases were well used.

Paper 4C - Written Coursework

About 75% of centres take this writing option. The candidature reflects the whole ability range and teachers clearly use the coursework as a tool for learning. Moderators reported that in the majority of cases great care had been taken with the preparation and presentation of the coursework units. This year there were fewer examples of centres where adjustments were necessary.

Administration

The moderation process is made smoother when the centre's administration is good. Arithmetical errors on the CF1 frontsheets or on the OPTEMS cause delays. Word counts should be accurate; in some cases rough estimates had been entered. Folders should be presented in the same order as they appear on the OPTEMS rather than in teaching group. Centres should check carefully that they are using the most recent version of the CF1 frontsheets which requires candidates and teachers to sign to authenticate the work.

Moderators are grateful for the careful presentation of folders for moderation. Ideally these are clearly labelled and in booklet form, rather than in plastic folders, which makes the reading of the whole submission easier.

Centres which are new to Edexcel are advised to check the administrative procedures carefully.

Rubric offences

In the past a number of centres have chosen coursework units from the same Area of Experience. There are five areas from which three units must be chosen:

- At Home and Abroad
- Education, Training and Employment
- House, Home and Daily Routine
- Media, Entertainment and Youth Culture
- Social Activities, Fitness and Health

Thus, it is not permitted to set two units on, say, a description of school and a description of work experience (both from the second Area of Experience) or a description of a famous personality and an essay about the environment.

This year, there were fewer examples of this of this rubric offence, but when it occurs the lower of the two overlapping marks is disregarded at moderation.

Short pieces of work cannot access the whole mark range. For grades C-A* candidates are required to produce between 500 and 600 words of German over three units. Therefore, it has to be expected that the length of one unit should be between 150 and 200 words.

Choice of coursework tasks

Most centres rely on a stimulus based on a textbook. This is acceptable, as long as candidates are given the opportunity to manipulate the language which they have learned. A simple title such as *Mein letzter Urlaub* is appropriate for better candidates as long as they know that they are required to show evidence of a range of tenses, syntax and opinions in their essay. Too often, candidates take the "cut-and-paste" option, simply copying sentences from their textbook sometimes without even adapting it.

For this reason, it is better to give more able candidates a stimulus which includes a set of bullet points, some straightforward, some more demanding. For example, the stimulus for a unit about Helping Around the House may be simply a title such as *Hausarbeit*, or it could be more structured:

Du liest diese Schlagzeile in einer Zeitschrift:

JUNGE LEUTE HELFEN NICHT GENUG ZU HAUSE

Der Artikel ist sehr negativ.

Schreib einen Brief an die Zeitschrift mit folgenden Informationen:

Wer du bist

Warum der Artikel dich geärgert hat

Wie du normalerweise zu Hause hilfst

Was du diese Woche schon gemacht hast

Warum du gern zu Hause hilfst

Warum junge Leute manchmal nicht gern helfen

Wie du nach deinen Prüfungen helfen wirst

This allows candidates to use predictable learned vocabulary in a range of tense and gives them the opportunity to include more original details. Of course the stimulus can be altered to suit the type of candidate, e.g. *Du hilfst nie zu Hause!*

Examples of more imaginative tasks which allowed candidates to produce more original language were:

- An interview with Britney Spears
- The script for a holiday programme
- A comparison of primary school with secondary school
- A description of how a town or area has changed over the past century including interviews with local residents of various ages
- A long advertisement for a health club including recommendations from two of its members

The last two examples allowed candidates to make excellent use of IT in the presentation of their work.

Candidates' work

At the top end of the scale, there are some impressive essays with a range of structures including inversion, subordination, modal verbs, infinitive clauses and a wide range of vocabulary. Candidates should be encouraged to avoid lists of nouns, repetitive structures, over-use of *es gibt* or *es ist* and they should use the dictionary as a checking tool rather than as an unlimited resource. Misuse of the dictionary always leads to some howlers:

- *Meine Frau wird habe eine sehr gute leiche.* (sic.)
- *Ich wohne in einem zwei Geschichtenhaus.* (sic.)

Where online dictionaries or translators are used, these should be declared as resources, but centres are advised to discourage their use.

It is important that candidates are given an armoury of structures to help them vary their prose. For example, weaker candidates can usually write a sentence such as *Meine Schule ist ziemlich groß*. The more able may well be able to write

- *Es nervt mich, dass meine Schule ziemlich groß ist.*
- *Ich finde es gut, dass meine Schule ziemlich groß ist, weil ...*
- *Meiner Meinung nach ist meine Schule ziemlich groß.*
- *Leider ist meine Schule ziemlich groß.*

Such structures can be used in a variety of situations and can help to avoid the pedestrian style which may prevent better candidates from accessing the top band of marks.

Statistics

Paper 1F - Listening and Responding

Grade	Max. Mark	C	D	E	F	G	U
Raw Boundary Mark	50	32	27	22	18	14	0
Uniform Boundary Mark	59	50	40	30	20	10	0

Paper 1H - Listening and Responding

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	U
Raw Boundary Mark	50	33	27	21	16	11	8	0
Uniform Boundary Mark	90	80	70	60	50	40	35	0

Paper 2F - Speaking

Grade	Max. Mark	C	D	E	F	G	U
Raw Boundary Mark	50	27	22	18	14	10	0
Uniform Boundary Mark	59	50	40	30	20	10	0

Paper 2H - Speaking

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	U
Raw Boundary Mark	50	40	34	28	23	17	14	0
Uniform Boundary Mark	90	80	70	60	50	40	35	0

Paper 3F - Reading and Responding

Grade	Max. Mark	C	D	E	F	G	U
Raw Boundary Mark	50	36	29	23	17	11	0
Uniform Boundary Mark	59	50	40	30	20	10	0

Paper 3H - Reading and Responding

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	U
Raw Boundary Mark	50	33	27	21	16	11	8	0
Uniform Boundary Mark	90	80	70	60	50	40	35	0

Paper 4F - Writing

Grade	Max. Mark	C	D	E	F	G	U
Raw Boundary Mark	50	33	28	23	18	13	0
Uniform Boundary Mark	59	50	40	30	20	10	0

Paper 4H - Writing

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	U
Raw Boundary Mark	50	38	33	28	24	18	15	0
Uniform Boundary Mark	90	80	70	60	50	40	35	0

Paper 4C - Written Coursework

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Raw Boundary Mark	60	51	45	39	33	27	21	15	9	0
Uniform Boundary Mark	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20	10	0

Overall Subject Boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Total Uniform Mark	360	320	280	240	200	160	120	80	40	0

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code UG 017963 Summer 2006

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications
Alternatively, you can contact Customer Services at www.edexcel.org.uk/ask or on 0870 240 9800

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH